

REMARKS

Claims 10-17 and 37-56 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-9 and 18-36 are cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 10, 12, and 13 are amended herein. New claims 37-56 are added herein. No new matter is added. New claims 45 and 51 and the claims that depend therefrom are drawn to an aircraft and, appropriately, belong to Group II which is the group that was elected to be prosecuted in the response submitted on October 18, 2005. As such, examination of these new claims is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheat (U.S. Pat. No. 4,853,555) in view of Hickey et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,089,042) or Harwood (U.S. Pat. No. 6,033,097). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 calls for “at least one continuous elongated receptacle having an elongated accessible first side . . . a connector selectively attachable to said bus strip at any location along said first side of said receptacle by insertion without rotation into said first side of said receptacle.” In contrast to an elongated accessible first side, the Wheat reference discloses a bus strip having only discreet points of accessibility. Additionally, both the Harwood and Hickey references appear to disclose bus strips wherein the connectors are attached by sliding the connectors into the bus strip from one of the ends thereof. That is, the Harwood and Hickey references both appear to disclose connectors that need to be inserted into the end of the bus strip and, thus, are not

inserted into an elongated accessible side of the receptacle as called for. As such, it is respectfully submitted that none of the references disclose, teach or provide motivation to arrive at all of the subject matter of claim 10. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 11-17 all depend from claim 10, and, therefore at least these same reasons as stated above with reference to claim 10 are also patentable over the prior art of record. Thus, withdraw of the instant rejection is requested.

Additionally, claim 12 calls for “said bus strip extends along said seat track with said first side facing said seat track.” It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not teach, disclose nor suggest this subject matter. Rather, the Wheat reference discloses the attachment features facing 90 degrees away from the seat track while Harwood and Hickey do not disclose a seat track much less the arrangement called for in claim 12. Thus, for at least this additional reason it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is further patentable over the prior art of record and withdraw the instant rejection is requested.

Moreover, claim 13 calls for “wherein said bus strip resides flush with or below a floor of said seating area.” It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not teach, disclose nor suggest this subject matter. Rather, the Wheat reference appears to disclose the conductor rail assembly being flush with the seat track but does not appear to disclose a relationship with the floor as called for while the Harwood and Hickey references do not disclose any type of seating area floor. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is patentable for at least this additional reason over the prior art of record and withdraw the instant rejection is requested.

Claim 15 calls for “wherein said receptacle has a locking detail that releasably engages with said plug to selectively attach said connector to said strip.” Applicant is unable to find a locking detail as called for. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically point out the structural features or disclosure within the prior art of record that disclose such a locking detail on the receptacle. Absence such a showing, withdraw of the rejection of claim 15 is requested.

New Claims

New claims 37-44 are added herein and depend from claim 10 or other claims dependant therefrom. Thus, for at least the same reasons stated above with reference to claim 10 it is respectfully submitted that claims 37-44 are also patentable over the prior art of record and allowance of these claims is requested. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that claims 37-44 define further patentable subject matter that is not disclosed taught nor suggested in the prior art of record. Accordingly, allowance of claims 37-44 is requested.

New claim 45 is added herein and calls for “said bus strip resides flush with or below said floor of said seating area.” It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not teach, suggest nor disclose this subject matter. Claims 46-50 all depend from claim 45. Thus, allowance of claims 45-50 is requested.

Claim 51 is added herein and calls for “a locking detail in said receptacle that releasably engages with said plug to selectively attach said connector to said strip; and

a retaining mechanism that releasably secures said connector to said bus strip, said retaining mechanism being a distinct and separate mechanism from said locking detail.” Applicant is unable to find such structural features or functionality in the prior art of record. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not teach, suggest nor disclose the subject matter of claim 51. Any rejection of claim 51 should include a detailed recitation of the structure in the prior art that shows such subject matter. Absence such a showing, allowance of claim 51 and dependant claims 52-56 is requested. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that dependant claims 52-56 further define patentable subject matter and, for at least this additional reason should be allowed. Accordingly, allowance of claims 51-56 is requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4-10-2006

By: JHU
Jeffrey H. Urian, Reg. No. 46,232

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JHU/ps